



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,998	06/21/2001	Takemori Takayama	980923A	5046

23850 7590 10/08/2002

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP  
1725 K STREET, NW.  
SUITE 1000  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

IP, SIKYIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1742

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2002

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/21/01
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 25-33 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 25-33 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☒ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) 09/137,845
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) 3
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claims 25-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claims 25 and 30 are indefinite because, for example, claimed limitations in claim 25 have not been active and positively recited in said claim. The wording “wherein” in line 1 is not a traditional transitional phrase for claim limitations. Moreover, the wording “imperfectly” in line is vague and indefinite.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating

obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 25-26 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over USP 6193820 to Girardello et al.

7. Girardello discloses the features including the claimed crawler belt bushing, three different hardened layers, hardness, microstructures, and its hardened outside layer to inner layer thickness ratio (Figures 7-8 and col. 5, lines 55-63). The difference between the reference(s) and the claims are as follows: Girardello does not explicitly disclose the inner layer is harder than the outer layer. But, the hardness according to Figures 1 and 7 are very close that either one could be higher or lower than the other. Furthermore, hardness on either layer exists in range and the range of the outer layer overlaps the inner layer. Therefore, optimization of a variable recognized in the art as a result-effective variable normally is considered to be within the ordinary skill of the art. See *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977).

8. With respect to the process limitations in the claims that the invention defined

in a product-by-process claim is a product, not a process. In re Bridgeford, 357 F. 2d 679, 149 USPQ 55 (CCPA 1966). It is the patentability of the product claimed and not of the recited process steps which must be established. See In re Brown, 459 F. 2d 531, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972) and In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976). The guidance that has been provided by court on this matter is

[i]f the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.

In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

9. Claims 27 and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over reference as applied to claims above, and further in view of JP 401272719.

10. The claimed subject matter as is disclosed and rejected above by the cited reference(s) except for the bushing steel composition. However, JP 401272719 in page 3, Table 1 discloses the claimed bushing steel is merely a conventional steel for bushing in the same field of endeavor or the analogous metallurgical art. Accordingly, it would have been prima facie obvious for an ordinary skill artisan motivated by a reasonable expectation of success to heat treat bushing as taught by Girardello with conventional bushing steel in order to obtain all of the known benefits. In re

LaVerne, et al., 108 USPQ 335.

***Conclusion***

The above rejection relies on the reference(s) for all the teachings expressed in the text(s) of the references and/or one of ordinary skill in the metallurgical art would have reasonably understood or implied from the text(s) of the reference(s). To emphasize certain aspect(s) of the prior art, only specific portion(s) of the text(s) have been pointed out. Each reference as a whole should be reviewed in responding to the rejection, since other sections of the same reference and/or various combination of the cited references may be relied on in future rejection(s) in view of amendment(s).

All recited limitations in the instant claims have been met by the rejections as set forth above.


Applicant is reminded that when amendment and/or revision is required, applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP § 2163.06 (a) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.119.

***Examiner Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Ip whose telephone number is (703) 308-2542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 5:30 A.M. to 2:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Roy V. King, can be reached on (703)-308-1146.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit 1742 are (703) 305-3601 (Official Paper only) and (703) 305-7719 (Unofficial Paper only). When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1700, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communication with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SIKYIN IP  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1742

S. Ip  
October 1, 2002